

It refused to make the total refinery cutback indicated, hoping for more sales and trying to keep its high import quota, which is based on its refinery input. Meanwhile, its importing parent, together with other importers, were allowed to increase their residual fuel quotas by 1,000 barrels daily to meet the increased "need" created when refinery A reduced residual yields.

Who lost the 1,000 barrels daily in order to keep the balance? Were crude import quotas cut 1,000 barrels daily to absorb any of the loss? Was the loss shared by the importing refinery and the domestic crude producers? Or is it obvious to all that under present regulations the domestic crude producers suffered the total loss of market.

While the refinery's crude imports even contributed 40 percent of the reduced domestic residual fuel yield in the first place, then imports were not called upon even to share the 1,000 barrel loss to imported residual fuel.

This, then, is the sage of refinery A. Little wonder some importing companies want present regulations continued with only one significant change—complete decontrol of imported residual fuel. This would mean intensification of the process by which American international oil companies increase their total imports, including residual fuel, at the direct expense of their domestic producer competitors.

CRISIS FOR COTTON

(Mr. SISK (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, all segments of our economy are awakening to the importance to them of stabilizing our cotton industry through passage of the Cooley bill, H.R. 6196. Farmers and industrial employees presently remote from direct connection with cotton in any form would feel the effect if the cotton industry is pinched out of existence, as is threatened if we do not pass this bill. Present cotton farmers would be forced to put their lands into competition with other agricultural production. Cotton industrial workers would be forced into other industries where labor surpluses presently exist.

I am glad to report that there is growing recognition of the impact of the cotton problem on other segments of our economy. Another evidence of this is a telegram I have just received from Mr. J. C. Baten, secretary of the International Chemical Workers Union No. 97, in Fresno, Calif. It read as follows:

FRESNO, CALIF.

Hon. B. F. SISK: The International Chemical Workers Union Local 97 is urging you to support the Cooley bill H.R. 6196. In an area where high unemployment is prevailing, we believe H.R. 6196 would help this situation and give the farmers a break they so badly need for fair competition. It would give economy a boost all over the United States therefore this union is in full support of bill H.R. 6196.

J. C. BATEN.

SEMINAR ON MUSIC EDUCATION

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major fields of concern to all of us interested in strengthening the arts and humanities is that of music education. A very significant seminar on music education, supported by the Office of Education as a part of its cooperative research program, has recently been completed at Yale University. This seminar, I believe, will serve as a focal point in the expansion and improvement of music education in our schools throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD at this time an article by Mr. Eric Salzmann appearing in the New York Times, July 7, 1963, covering some of the significant results of this unique meeting.

This seminar on music education is an example of the type of development and use of our artistic brainpower which is possible and which could be supported to a much greater extent under the provisions of my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, introduced on January 9 of this year—H.R. 324. When I read of the results of such a far-ranging meeting of minds, possible perhaps only through the support and encouragement of an agency of the Federal Government such as the U.S. Office of Education, I am more than ever convinced of the need for such legislation as I have proposed.

This beginning has been made in the field of music. However, much remains to be done in the other arts as well if we are to bring to bear our best artistic resources on our programs of education and participation in the arts.

TEACHERS UNDER FIRE

(By Eric Salzmann)

A long and loud vote of no confidence in American public school education was offered last month at a conference of distinguished musicians and teachers held under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The conference, or seminar on music education, was held at Yale University in the last 2 weeks of June. It was a remarkable meeting of representatives of every aspect of American musical life and activity who came together with the aim of evaluating and reevaluating American musical education in the primary and secondary grades.

If the initial premises and prognoses were negative, the results of the conclave were not. Somehow, the congruence of a variety of vastly differing musical backgrounds, minds, points of view, and approaches produced clear outlines of new concepts of music teaching designed to involve children in genuine and profound musical experiences.

The impulse for the seminar came from, of all places, the President's Office of Science and Technology; the event was financed by the U.S. Office of Education. The prototypes for the meeting can be found in the fields of science and mathematics. The Sputnik Age found American basic scientific education still in the age of Euclid and Newton; distinguished scientists and mathematicians, working through the prestige and good offices of the Government, have since brought about an educational revolution from the primary grades on up. Now, for the first time, it was being asked whether similar reforms were not needed in one of the arts and the answer was emphatically in the affirmative.

The 30 participants in the seminar included a large group of composer-educators and composer-performers (Lukas Foss, Leon Kirchner, Edward T. Cone, Otto Luening, Henry Brant, Lionel Nowak, Howard Boat-

wright, Gid Waldrop, and from the jazz field, Billy Taylor and Mercer Ellington), performers (Adele Addison, Norah Greenberg, Milton Katims), critics, theoreticians, musicologists and ethnomusicologists.

There was agreement that American public school music education had its bright spots and positive achievements. The high technical quality of band, orchestra, and choral performance was often cited and individual examples of excellent educational achievement were brought forward.

The general situation across the country however, was found to be very poor; in most schools, in the elementary grades, untrained classroom teachers are charged with the responsibility of giving children the basic musical skills which the teachers themselves do not possess, and the means and equipment provided for the purpose of accomplishing this hopeless goal are almost invariably inadequate and antimusical.

POINT OF UNANIMITY

Interestingly enough, there was almost no conflict on these points between the educators and the "practicing" musicians. The educators were convinced of the magnitude of the problem and of the need for close contact between the living world of musical creation and performance just as the practicing musicians were sensitive to the need for close involvement in the educational process from the lowest grades.

If the 12 days of panels, papers, discussions, section meetings and plenary sessions produced any ideological divisions at all, it was primarily between those who wanted to place the principal emphasis on the great Western tradition of the last two centuries and the strong group who felt that it was at least as important to broaden our musical and educational horizons to include early Western music, non-Western music, recent avant-garde developments including electronic music as well as nonconcert music of all types.

A great deal of emphasis was put, not only on children's performance activities, but also on creativity; there was wide agreement as to the importance of a program designed to foster creative musical expression from the earliest grades as a means of building and training basic musicality in every child.

The importance of student involvement and activity at every level of the educational process was a constant theme of the discussions. The experience of live music was also stressed and, in this connection, it was urged that solo performers and chamber ensembles be brought into the schools on an in-residence basis similar to that already used in the Ford Foundation's composers-in-residence program.

The work of the seminar was only a first step. Its conclusions will be described in a report to the Office of Education to be made by Claude Palisca, who is associate professor of the history of music at Yale and director of the seminar. The report will serve both as a mandate and a guide for the work of a followup committee that will have the responsibility of finding ways of implementing these ideas in practical terms.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 101, on a motion to recommit H.R. 5171, authorizing GSA to coordinate purchase and maintenance of data processing equipment for Federal agencies, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."